

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended and new claims 21-23 are added.

The Office Action Summary indicates that claims 1 and 5-8 are rejected. However, the Office Action only details rejections of claims 1, 5, 7 and 8. Further, the Office Action and the Office Action Summary both indicate that claim 6 is allowable. Therefore, it is believed that the Office Action Summary inadvertently included claim 6 as a rejected claim, and that claim 6 is not a rejected claim. If this understanding is incorrect, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 be specified in detail.

In section 1 on pages 2-3, the Office Action rejects claims 1, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 3,003,890 to Hanenkamp in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,983,058 to Nagae. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, "said take-up spool being prevented from rotating in said second direction ... ." In contradistinction, Hanenkamp does not disclose, teach or suggest a mechanism for preventing the take-up spool from rotating in a second direction.

Claim 1 further recites, "said take-up spool being prevented from rotating in said second direction as said engaging member engages with the first wall ... ." In contradistinction, Nagae discloses a hold spring 53 for pressing the ink ribbon wound around the take-up spool 9 such that the ink ribbon 11 is prevented from being loosened (Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 45-49). However, the hold spring 53 does not engage with the take-up spooler.

Claims 7 and 8 are allowable based at least on their dependence from claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 8 as being unpatentable over Hanenkamp in view of Nagae be withdrawn.

In section 2 on page 4, the Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanenkamp in view of Nagae and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,521,125 to Turbon. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 is allowable based at least on its dependence from claim 1 for the reasons stated above in connection with the rejection of claim 1. Turbon fails to overcome the deficiencies in Hanenkamp and Nagae discussed above.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 5 as being unpatentable over Hanenkamp in view of Nagae and further in view of Turbon be withdrawn.

New claim 21 corresponds to original claim 2 written in independent form including all of the limitations of claim 1 from which it directly depended. New claim 22 corresponds to originally pending claim 6 including all the limitations of claim 1 and intervening claim 5 from which it depended. New claim 23 corresponds to originally pending claim 9 rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of claim 1 and intervening claim 8 from which it originally depended. In paragraph 3 on page 4, the Office Action indicates that this subject matter is allowable in this form.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-23 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Mark R. Woodall  
Registration No. 43,286

JAO:MRW/sqb

Attachment:  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: December 23, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--